

**Remarks**

Entrance of this amendment and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. Claims 1-3 & 5-20 remain pending.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the time afforded their undersigned representative on July 8, 2008, regarding Applicants' proposed amendment to independent claim 1. The revised amendment submitted herewith is responsive to the Examiner's concerns raised during the telephone interview. Specifically, the previously proposed "non-static data frame" is deleted in favor of "one other data frame" language in the claims presented. Further, Applicants have amended computer program product claims 16-20 to address the Examiner's concern regarding the language previously contained therein.

Support for the amended independent claims can be found throughout the application as filed. For example, reference paragraphs [0034] – [0040] of the specification, and FIG. 3. The "plurality of data frames including at least one static data frame and at least one other data frame", recitation is believed supported by paragraph [0035], which explains that, within the frame set, some of the data frames may be static pages, which do not to receive updates. As indicated in paragraph [0034], "data frame" and "page" are used interchangeably in the application. Therefore, one or more of the data frames of the frame set may be static data frames, and paragraph [0035] also indicates that an update process is provided for a data frame. This data frame is referred to as the at least one other data frame, which is to undergo the update process. Thus, the frameset includes at least one static data frame and at least one other data frame. The update process for the at least one other data frame is initiated by the startMonitoring() function. No new matter is added to the application by any amendment presented.

In the Office Action, previously pending claims 1-3, 5, 7-13, 15-18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bautista-Lloyd et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0152239 A1; hereinafter Bautista-Lloyd) in view of Rees (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0098493 A1; hereinafter Rees), while claims 6, 14 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bautista-Lloyd in view of Tuttle et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 7043525 B2; hereinafter Tuttle). These rejections are respectfully

traversed to any extent deemed applicable to the amended claims presented herewith, and reconsideration thereof is requested.

Applicants' independent claims presented herewith recite that the plurality of data frames of a frameset include at least one static data frame and at least one other data frame (i.e., a data frame that is not static). Further, the independent claims recite automatically, periodically retrieving server event data for one other data frame of the at least one other data frame when the one other data frame is the visible frame. In Applicants' invention, a data frame that receives event data is the one other data frame that needs to be updated. The startMonitoring() function is designed to set data frames that require updates apart from data frames that do not require updates by identifying the data frame requiring an update (see paragraph [0035]) when loaded for viewing. As a data frame becomes visible, startMonitoring() passes a keyword to the refresh frame for an update retrieval. That keyword identifies the data frame that requires the update, according to paragraph [0035] of the specification. The refresh frame passes the same keyword identifying that data frame to the server to retrieve the update, as explained in paragraph [0036] of the specification. The application scripts on the server side use the keyword to determine if there is any new event data (see paragraph [0037]), and return the new event data to the refresh frame. Therefore, event data retrieval is associated with only the one data frame, which is the visible data frame identified by that keyword.

Explained further, in accordance with Applicants' invention, an update retrieval for a data frame only occurs during the interval period when the data frame is visible. Paragraph [0035] indicates that the startMonitoring() is used to initiate the update process for a data frame that requires an update. startMonitoring() is called from a Javascript event handler window.onload. According to Javascript's specification, the window.onload event handler is invoked by the browser window when the browser window loads a page. In this case, the window.onload event handler is invoked when it loads a data frame since "data frame" and "page" are used interchangeably in the application. By triggering startMonitoring() in window.onload, the data frame that requires an update starts to receive the update as soon as it is displayed by the browser. Paragraph [0040] indicates the data frame stops receiving updates through a function stopMonitoring() which is triggered from a Javascript event handler window.onunload. According to Javascript specification, the window.onunload event handler is invoked by the browser window when the browser window unloads a page or a user leaves a page. In this case,

window.onunload is invoked when the browser window unloads a data frame. Therefore, a data frame receives updates during the period after the browser loads it and before the browser unloads it, which is the period that the data frame is visible.

Applicants respectfully submit that a careful reading of Bautista-Lloyd, Rees and Tuttle fails to uncover any similar teaching or suggestion. In Bautista-Lloyd, the update process retrieves updates for all frames upon one refresh request. Thus, in addition to Bautista-Lloyd not describing static frames which do not require updates. Bautista-Lloyd also does not teach or suggest retrieving updates for one data frame only when the data frame is a visible frame. In Rees, the entire frameset is reloaded whenever an update takes place, meaning event data for all the frames contained in the frame set is retrieved. Thus, Rees also does not teach or suggest retrieving updates for one data frame of a plurality of data frames only when the data frame is the visible data frame. Tuttle, cited in the Office Action with respect to dependent claims 6, 14 & 19, also does not appear to teach or suggest that only one object is visible, or that updates are retrieved for only a visible object.


For at least the above-noted reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims presented patentably distinguish over the known art.

The dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for their own additional characterizations. Numerous dependent claims are amended herein to provide further characterization of Applicant's invention in the hope of advancing prosecution of the subject application.

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

*Should any issue remain unresolved, however, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number provided.*

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kevin P. Radigan  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 31,789

Dated: July 18, 2008.

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.  
5 Columbia Circle  
Albany, New York 12203-5160  
Telephone: (518) 452-5600  
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579